



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,588	12/22/2003	Michael N. Burdenko	8558-AFP/GDM	7987

20349 7590 03/22/2005

POLAROID CORPORATION
PATENT DEPARTMENT
1265 MAIN STREET
WALTHAM, MA 02451

EXAMINER

LANGDON, EVAN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3654

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/743,588

Applicant(s)

BURDENKO, MICHAEL N.

Examiner

Evan H Langdon

Art Unit

3654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7 and 8 is/are rejected. .
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 February 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/26/04.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

Drawings

The drawings were received on 28 February 2005. These drawings are accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The plurality of pressure rollers have not been disclose as being in line, or mounted in the same radial position.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weiss (US 4,932,577) in view of Sainio et al. (US 6,250,220 B1).

Weiss discloses a drive roller assembly for pulling print media, comprising:

a rigid drive roller 38 having a length; and

plurality of pressure rollers 30, 32 adapted for pressing print media against said drive roller over substantially different portions of the length,

Art Unit: 3654

each of the plurality of pressure rollers having a length less than the first length of the drive roller (see Figure 2, drive roller 38 extends further than pressure rollers 30,32).

Sainio teaches a pressure roller 34 having two pressure regions aligned in the same radial position whose pressures can be controlled by each of two sensors 56 and two pressure reducing valves 58 to effectively vary the pressure of each region (col. 5 lines 5-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the pressure rollers of Weiss to include independent pressure control as suggested by Sainio, to control the web by varying the pressure of each pressure roller.

In regards to claim 2, Weiss as modified by Sainio teaches each of the plurality of pressure rollers 30, 32 is mounted at a different radial position with respect to the axis of rotation of the drive roller 38 (Weiss).

In regards to claim 3, Weiss as modified by Sainio teaches the different radial positions of the pressure rollers are adjacent to each other, as seen in Figures 2 and 6 (Weiss).

In regards to claim 5, Weiss as modified by Sainio teaches the pressure applied by one of the pressure rollers can be greater than the pressure applied by the second pressure roller (Sainio).

In regards to claim 7, Weiss as modified by Sainio teaches that the axis of rotation of the pressure roller can become not parallel to the axis of rotation of the drive roller since the pressure is applied in a cantilever manner causing the axis of the two rollers to not be parallel.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weiss as modified by Sainio, as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Yukio (US 4,720,714).

Art Unit: 3654

Yukio teaches a drive roller assembly having a rigid drive roller 32 the has a hard outer surface including a plurality of helical grooves 54, and explained in col. 4, lines 33-42, formed in the outer surface in each helical direction of rotation.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the drive roller of Weiss as modified by Sainio to include helical grooves as suggested by Yukio, to provide an improved frictional surface.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The amendment to claim 1 necessitated the new ground of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 3654

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Evan H Langdon whose telephone number is (703)-306-5768. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathy Matecki can be reached on (703)-308-2688. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ehl

Kathy Matecki

KATHY MATECKI
SUPERVISOR OF PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNICAL CENTER 2800